



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,511	03/29/2001	Don Rutledge Day	AUS920010001US1	5448
7590 01/03/2006			EXAMINER	
Duke W. Yee Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP P.O. Box 802334 Dallas, TX 75380			NGUYEN, MAIKHANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/820,511

Applicant(s)

DAY ET AL.

Examiner

Maikhanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13,15-20 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13,15-20 and 22-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***DETAILED ACTION***

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 10/11/2005 to the original application filed 03/29/2001.
2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-26 are currently pending in this application. Claims 3, 10, 14, and 21 have been cancelled. Claims 8, 19, and 25 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 25 are independent claims.

***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 23-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. As to claim 23, the claimed “in a tangible computer readable medium” should read “in a computer storage medium” to direct to a statutory subject matter; and
  - b. As to claim 25, the claimed “in a computer readable medium” should read “in a computer storage medium” to direct to a statutory subject matter. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

*This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).*

5. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 12-13, 15-18, and 23-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** (U.S. 6,121,970 – issued 09/2000) in view of **Sussman** (U.S. 5,586,196 – filed 12/1996, as cited in the Applicant's IDS filed 05/29/2001).

**As to claim 1**

- a. Guedalia teaches method for magnifying a portion of a document in a browser *on a client (see the Abstract)*, comprising:
- (i) presenting a first document in a first display in the browser on the client (e.g., *receiving by the client computer from the server an HTML page; Abstract/col.4, lines 29-41/col.5, lines 52-53/col.8, lines 51-52*);
  - (ii) generating a magnified display of the first document in memory at the client (e.g., *a user 32, who operates the client computer 20, interactively controls the image portion displayed ...views the display screen; col.12, lines 51-58*);
  - (iii) displaying in a second display in the browser a selected portion of the magnified display corresponding to a selected portion of the first document (e.g., *generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second*

*image being an enlarged portion of the image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; see the Abstract);*

- (iv) response to receiving a request for an action within the second display; and performing the action with respect to the first document (*col.15, lines 42-51 and see fig.3*).
- b. Guedalia teach image map (*e.g., image maps; col.14, line 33*); however, does not explicitly teach “*mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document.*”
- c. Sussaman teaches mapping the selected portion of the magnified display to a display space of the selected portion of the first document (*col.29, lines 42-45/ col.30, lines 37-46 & Fig.21*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Angiulo in the system of Sussaman because it would provided the capability for achieving the desired display effects while minimizing memory and computing requirements through a combined hardware/software strategy based on a specific organization of computer memory.

**As to claim 2**

Guedalia teaches a selection of a link within the magnified portion and the step of performing the action comprises retrieving and displaying a second document corresponding to the link in the first display (*e.g., generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being enlarged portion of the first image, and the*

Art Unit: 2176

*enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location ...sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; col.17, lines 56-63).*

**As to claim 4**

Guedalia teaches mapping the magnified portion to the first document (*e.g., a link to a second image, the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image; Abstract*) to form an imagemap (*e.g., image maps; col.3, lines 33-35*).

**As to claim 5**

- a. Guedalia teaches creating the second display, wherein the second display has a magnified display space based on a magnification factor (*col.13, line 64- col. 14, line 17*), and populating pixels in the second display to form a magnified display (*col.14, line 62 – col.15, line 10*).
- b. Guedalia, however, does not explicitly teach “*reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document.*”
- c. Sussaman teaches reading pixels from video memory for the magnified portion in a normal display space for the original document (*col.3, lines 24-67*).
- d. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Angiulo in the system of Sussaman because it would have provided the capability for achieving the desired display effects while minimizing memory and computing requirements through a combined hardware/software strategy based on a specific organization of computer memory.

**As to claim 6**

Art Unit: 2176

Guedalia teaches populating pixels in the second display comprises for each pixel of the normal display space, populating adjacent pixels based on the magnification factor (*col.8, lines 55-60 & col.14, line 62-col.15, line 10*).

**As to claim 7**

Guedalia teaches mapping a magnified display space for the magnified portion to corresponding pixels in a normal display space for the original document (*e.g., The response image portion is magnified to fit the size of the full view window, giving the effect of a zoom-in; col.14, lines 14-17 and col. 16, lines 39-54*).

**As to claim 12**

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 13**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claims 15-18**

They include the same limitations as in claims 4-7, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 23**

It is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 24**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

6. Claims 8-9, 11, 19-20, 22, and 25-26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Guedalia** in view of **Hsing et al.** (U.S. 6,826,726, filed 08/2001, priority 08/2000).

**As to claim 8**

- a. Guedalia teaches a method for magnifying a portion of a document in a browser (*e.g., the HTML page ...the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image; see Abstract*), comprising:
- (i) presenting a first document in a first display in the browser (*e.g., receiving by the client computer from the server an HTML page; Abstract/col.4, lines 29-41/col.5, lines 52-53/col.8, lines 51-52*);
  - (ii) receiving a selection of a portion of the first document (*e.g., sending by the client computer to the server computer an indication of the sub-region selected by the user; Abstract*);
  - (iii) generating a magnified display of the selected portion from the structure of the first document (*e.g., generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being an enlarged portion of the image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; see the Abstract*), wherein the magnified display of the selected portion of the first document is generated at a client based on the corresponding portion of the



- first document (*e.g., a user 32, who operates the client computer 20, interactively controls the image portion displayed ...views the display screen; col.12, lines 51-58*);
- (iii) presenting the magnified display (*e.g., the second image being an enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; Abstract / col.13, lines 60-67 and col.17, lines 56-61*);
- (iv) receiving a request for an action within the magnified display; and performing the action with respect to the magnified display (*e.g., items 86-94 in Fig.4*).
- b. Guedalia does not explicitly teach “*analyzing a document object model for the first document; and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document.*”
- d. Hsing teaches analyzing a document object model for the first document (*the DOM specification, an XML document may be represented as a logical “tree” ...DOM will have a node corresponding to the each such data element. When data in XML document is added, deleted, or modified, the DOM also changes to reflect the modification; col.2, lines 25-55 & col.3, line 60-col.4, line 9*); and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document (*a unique ID attribute the uniquely identifies distinguishes it from other element; col.4, lines 30-67 and Fig. 8*).
- e. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the feature from Hsing in the system of Guedalia

because it would have provided the capability for reducing the number of accesses from client to server that will require the transmission of only the smallest amount of data is necessary to provide complete information for the server to update its database.

**As to claim 9**

Guedalia teaches a selection of a link within the magnified portion and the step of performing the action comprises retrieving and displaying a second document corresponding to the link in the first display (*e.g., generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being enlarged portion of the first image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location ...sending by the server computer to the client computer the new HTML page; col.17, lines 56-63*).

**As to claim 11**

Guedalia teaches adjusting attributes of nodes based on a magnification factor (*col.16, lines 58-col.17, line 10*).

**As to claim 19**

It is directed to an apparatus for performing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 20**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 2, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 22**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 11, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 25**

It is directed to a computer program product for implementing the method of claim 8, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**As to claim 26**

It includes the same limitations as in claim 9, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicants' arguments filed 10/11/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not teach generating a magnified display of any at the client* (Remarks, page 13).

In response, *Guedalia teaches generating a magnified display of any at the client (e.g., a user 32, who operates the client computer 20, interactively controls the image portion displayed ...views the display screen; col.12, lines 51-58).*

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not teach displaying in a second display in the browser at selected portion of the magnified display corresponding to the selected portion of the first document* (Remarks, page 14).

In response, Guedalia teaches displaying in a second display in the browser at selected portion of the magnified display corresponding to the selected portion of the first document (*e.g., generate a new HTML page with a link to a second image, the second image being an enlarged portion of the image, and the enlarged portion of the first image corresponding to the selected location; see the Abstract*).

Applicant argues that *Guedalia does not teach a request for an action within that enlarged image portion* (Remarks, page 15).

In response, Guedalia does teach a request for an action within that enlarged image portion (*e.g., the client receives the new HTMP page ...the client send the request for the image portion back to server; col.15, lines 42-51 and see fig.3*).

Applicant argues that *Hsing does not teach magnifying a portion of a document in a browser comprising "analyzing a document object model for a first document" and "identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document" as is claimed in independent claim 1* (Remarks, page 23).

In response, the Examiner respectfully notes that independent claim 1 does not require these steps. However, the claim limitations are recited in claim 8. Hsing teaches analyzing a document object model for the first document (*the DOM specification, an XML document may be represented as a logical "tree" ...DOM will have a node corresponding to the each such data element. When data in XML document is added, deleted, or modified, the DOM also changes to reflect the modification; col.2, lines 25-55*

*& col.3, line 60-col.4, line 9); and identifying a portion of the document object model that corresponds to the selected portion of the first document (a unique ID attribute the uniquely identifies distinguishes it from other element; col.4, lines 30-67 and Fig. 8).*

Applicant argues that *Hsing does not teach “the magnified display of the selected portion of the first document is generated at a client based on the corresponding portion of the first document”* (Remarks, page 23).

In response, Guedalia is used to teach “the magnified display of the selected portion of the first document is generated at a client based on the corresponding portion of the first document” as claimed. It is noted that the rejection above shows how Guedalia meet the claims limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Maeda et al. U.S. Publication 2001/0054049 A1 Pub. Date: Dec. 20, 2001

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4093. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

*William L. Bashore*  
**WILLIAM BASHORE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
*12/29/2005*